

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemilainen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,766,160) in view of Burgess et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,228). Claims 3, 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lemilainen et al. in view of Burgess et al., and further in view of Reed (U.S. Patent No. 6,665,549).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1, 4 and 7 under §103(a), the Examiner states that Lemilainen et al. in view of Burgess et al. renders the claims obvious. Lemilainen et al. discloses an apparatus, and associated method, for facilitating authentication of communication stations in a mobile communication system; and, Burgess et al. discloses an open loop receiver.

Each of Claims 1, 4 and 7 recite receiving the data from a mobile communication system in a first format, converting the data from the first format to data packets for Bluetooth, and transmitting the converted data packets; that is, in each of the independent claims, the data that is received is the data that is converted, which is the same data that is transmitted. In other words, the portable phone of the claims of the present application acts as a repeater for the data, in order to receive and forward the data to the slave device.

In Lemilainen et al., on the other hand, is a device that can operate in a cellular mode or a Bluetooth mode. Data is communicated to/from the device in one of the two modes. There are no master/slave (i.e. repeater) functions in Lemilainen et al. that receives data, converts that data, and transmits the converted data.

Further, although Burgess et al. mentions master and slave devices, the master device, similar to the device in Lemilainen et al., does not receive data, convert that same data, and then transmit that converted data, in the repeater fashion of the claims of the present application.

Based on at least the foregoing withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1, 4 and 7 under §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1, 4 and 7 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 8 and 9, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 8 and 9 is respectfully requested.

In view of the preceding remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely 1-9 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr